



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

under an agreement providing that such companies should forward, reload, and return them to the defendant railroad, an Indiana corporation. The cars were standing empty when attached. *Held*, that the cars are subject to judicial process, although engaged in interstate commerce. *Davis v. Cleveland, Cincinnati, & St. Louis Ry.*, 30 Sup. Ct. 463.

This important question, hitherto undetermined by the Supreme Court, presented a conflict in the state courts. See *Wall v. Railroad Co.*, 52 W. Va. 485; *Southern Ry. Co. v. Brown*, 131 Ga. 245. The present decision is of most importance in deciding that the action Congress has taken concerning the forwarding of cars engaged in interstate commerce does not prevent their attachment. See U. S. COMP. ST. (1901) pp. 3564, 3154. The state statute providing for such judicial process is held not unconstitutional, although broader statutes have been construed not to apply to cars in this situation. *Michigan Central Ry. Co. v. Chicago & Michigan Lake Shore Ry. Co.*, 1 Ill. App. 399. Therefore the court will decide in each particular case whether or not the attachment is void. The opinion in the principal case is confined to the facts presented, which are the least difficult of determination. But it is believed that the Court will be very unwilling to restrict the states in such an important function as the collection of debts, when there is no legislative act of the state directly affecting interstate commerce. *Johnson v. Chicago & Pacific Elevator Co.*, 119 U. S. 388; *The Winnebago*, 205 U. S. 354. Certainly the former distinction between foreign and domestic attachment will be disregarded. *Connery v. Quincy, Omaha, & Kansas City Ry. Co.*, 92 Minn. 20. Indeed it would be wise to take the position that no judicial process under the usual attachment laws is invalid. But see 20 HARV. L. REV. 319.

INTERSTATE COMMERCE — CONTROL BY STATES — EFFECT OF POSTPONEMENT CLAUSE IN FEDERAL STATUTE. — A federal statute was passed prescribing a maximum number of hours of employment for telegraph operators engaged in interstate transportation. This statute was not to take effect until one year after its passage. During this period a state statute was passed fixing a shorter maximum number of hours for railroad telegraph operators. The defendant, an interstate carrier, was sued for a violation of this state statute, committed before the federal statute went into effect and relating to the employment of an operator having to do with interstate trains. *Held*, that the state statute is invalid. *People v. Erie R. R. Co.*, 135 N. Y. App. Div. 767.

In matters of interstate commerce which do not require uniformity throughout the United States the power of Congress is only potentially exclusive and the states have concurrent jurisdiction until Congress acts. *Cooley v. Board of Wardens of Phila.*, 12 How. (U. S.) 299; *Nashville, etc. Ry. v. Alabama*, 128 U. S. 96. The number of hours of employment of telegraph operators directing the operation of interstate trains is not a subject so national in character as to require uniformity, and therefore regulation is allowable under the police power reserved to the states. *State v. Chicago, M. & St. P. R. R. Co.*, 136 Wis. 407. *Cf. Smith v. Alabama*, 124 U. S. 465. Likewise Congress has power to regulate such matters. See *Employers' Liability Cases*, 207 U. S. 463, 495. A statute may exist for many purposes before it actually goes into effect. *The People v. Inglis*, 161 Ill. 256; *Stine v. Bennett*, 13 Minn. 153. In the present case the federal act was effective immediately on its passage as a declaration of the purpose of Congress to assume exclusive jurisdiction. Therefore the statute was rightly held to represent sufficient congressional action to exclude future state legislation on the same subject. *State v. Mo. Pac. Ry. Co.*, 212 Mo. 658; *State v. Chicago, M. & St. P. R. R. Co.*, *supra*. But as to state statutes in force before its passage, it is submitted that the federal act should have no effect during the postponement period. Thus a federal bankruptcy law with a similar postponement clause does not suspend existing state insolvent laws until the day it goes into effect. *Larrabee v. Talbot*, 5 Gill (Md.) 426, 441.